UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/727,091 | 12/02/2003 | Sebastian Sommer | 22700 | 6002 |
| ••• | 7590 12/18/200 KARL F ROSS | EXAMINER | | |
| 5676 RIVERDA | ALE AVENUE | AFTERGUT, JEFF H | | |
| PO BOX 900 RIVERDALE (BRONX), NY 10471-0900 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1733 | |
| | | | <u> </u> | |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR | Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MO | NTHS | 12/18/2006 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | _ |
|---|---|
| / | |
| 4 | |
| " | |
| • | |

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Office A - 4' O | 10/727,091 | SOMMER ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Jeff H. Aftergut | 1733 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 November 2006</u> . 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11. | epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj | 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: | te | | | |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Putnam et al in view of Evans (U.S. 3,485,706, newly cited).

Putnam is discussed at length in paragraph 3 of the Office action dated May 9, 2006 and applicant is referred to the same for a complete discussion of the reference. The applicant in the reply admitted that the reference taught the steps of :

"a) (forming filaments), b) (collecting the filaments into a spun-bond web, and d) hydrodynamically consolidating the spun-bond web" (see reply dated 11-2-06 page 4 of the reply).

The applicant argues that while there is admittedly a step of "treating the filaments with a wetting agent", the reference treated the hydroentangled filaments with the wetting agent after the hydroentangling step and not prior to the hydroentangling operation. The claims have been amended to recite that the application of the wetting agent is prior to the hydroentangling of the spun bonded web.

Evans taught that it was known at the time the invention was made to hydroentangle a nonwoven web with water jet entangling wherein prior to the hydroentangling operation one was directed to apply a wetting agent to the web in order to increase the ease of processing of the web, see column 16, lines 39-42, column 28,

lines 55-73. Evans taught that one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made would have applied a wetting agent to a nonwoven material prior to the hydroentangling operation therein in order to increase the ease of processing of the nonwoven web in the hydroentangling operation and additionally that the wetting agents could by included in the hydroentangling fluid itself. Since it would have facilitated the ease of handling of the hydroentangling operation in Putnam et al, it would have been obvious to include a step of applying a wetting agent to the nonwoven spun bond web of Putnam et al prior to the hydroentangling therein as taught by Evans for the purpose of making the entangling operation easier.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant argues that the reference to Putnam et al expressed the application of the wetting agent subsequent to the hydroentangling operation and there is no indication that one skilled in the art would have applied the wetting agent prior to the hydroentangling operation. the applicant is advised that the newly cited reference to Evans made clear that one skilled in the art would have applied the wetting agent prior to the hydroentangling operation and that this would have been performed in order to make the processing via hydroentangling easier. It would have been obvious to apply the wetting agent prior to the hydroentangling operation in Putnam et al in order to make such processing (the water jet needling) easier.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff H. Aftergut whose telephone number is 571-272-1212. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:15-345 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1733

JHA December 12, 2006